

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application for the reasons noted hereinafter is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-68 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Furukawa (JP 2000357064) in view of Shimomura (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0095432; hereinafter “Shimomura”).

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Furukawa in view of Shimomura, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection and traverse the rejection as discussed next.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 17 are directed to an image forming device, including, *inter alia*:

...an identification information reading unit that reads identification information of a document;

an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to said identification information, said system performing processing on the document; and

an operation control unit that controls an execution of a predetermined operation to be performed on the document according to the operation requirement selected by said operation requirement selection unit.

Independent Claim 17 recites similar features as Claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented below with respect to Claim 1 are also applicable to Claim 17.

Furukawa describes a composite machine capable of improving security.¹ However, Applicants respectfully submit that Furukawa fails to teach or suggest “an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to said

¹ See paragraphs [0001]-[0004] of Furukawa.

identification information, said system performing processing on the document,” as recited in independent Claims 1 and 17.

Furukawa describes that

...specific equipment 120 manages the information on permitted operation for every user permitted to use every equipment and on the basis of this managing information, every equipment issues permission or does not issue permission to an operation performed by the user.² Thus, the precise usage control can be executed for every equipment and operations which can be performed by the user is limited so that security can be improved.

Thus, Furukawa describes that various operations are performed on a document based upon user information associated with a user ID. However, Furukawa, does not describe that an operation requirement selection unit selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to the identification information, and that the system performs processing of the document. In other words, in Furukawa, processes can be performed on a document based upon the user identification information, i.e. certain permissions are tied to a specific user. In contrast, in Applicants’ Claim 1, operations on a document are controlled based on a document’s association with a particular type of system. Thus, in Applicants’ invention, it is possible to flexibly perform comprehensive management functions and control specific processing functions of a specific document.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 17 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguish over Furukawa. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimomura fails to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies in Furukawa.

Amended independent Claims 59, 61, 64, 65, 67, and 68 recite "selecting one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection

² See the Abstract of Furukawa.

with each type of a system according to said identification information, said system performing processing on the document," and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding ground for rejection has been overcome and that Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 patentably define over the prior art. Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
DPB/rac

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944

I:\ATTY\DPB\24's\243004US\243004US-AM3.DOC